



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/280,518	04/05/1999	KENSUKE FUJIWARA	32739M008	5926
7590	11/21/2003		EXAMINER	
BEVERIDGE DEGRANDI WEILACHER & YOUNG SUITE 800 1850 M STREET N W WASHINGTON, DC 20036			PHAM, HAI CHI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2861	
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/280,518	FUJIWARA, KEN SUKE
	Examiner Hai C Pham	Art Unit 2861

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C Pham. (3) _____.
 (2) Michael A. Makuch, Attorney. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 November 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Arevalo (U.S. 6,104,986).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative argues that the invention differs from the prior art as taught by Arevalo in that the application does neither disclose nor claim that there is further fine divided intervals being applied to the consecutive iterations in the determination of the optimum value as taught by Arevalo. Applicant's Representative further argues that there is no teaching from the Applicant's acknowledged prior art and Arevalo to search for the desired potential along the nonlinear curve for the laser intensity vs potential as in the invention and the linear method of Applicant's acknowledged prior art. The examiner indicates that the specification will be reevaluated with respect to the first argument as well as the combination of the prior arts. .

HCP

6/19/03